

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
211 W. ASPEN AVENUE, FLAGSTAFF, AZ
APRIL 21, 2005
MINUTES**

Board Members Present:

Elizabeth Stewart, Chairman
William Porter (arrived at 9:05 a.m.)
John Hays
William Cordasco
William Scalzo
Mark Winkleman (arrived at 9:10 a.m.)

Board Members Absent:

Janice Chilton

Staff Present:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administration
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs
Cristie Statler, Executive Consultant
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary

Attorney General's Office:

Patricia Boland, Assistant Attorney General

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Chairman Stewart called the meeting to order at 8:55 a.m. She announced that Mr. Bill Scalzo has joined the Parks Board as a new member. He is the Director of the Maricopa County Department of Parks and Recreation and has served for seven years on AORCC. She welcomed Mr. Scalzo to the Board and stated that the Board is looking forward to benefiting from his expertise.

The members of the Board and Executive Staff introduced themselves. Chairman Stewart requested that any member of the public who wished to address the Board complete a Request to Speak form.

C. CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Approve Minutes of March 17, 2005 State Parks Board Meeting**
- 2. Designation of Park Ranger Enforcement Officers** - Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks Board designate Robert Horn, Andrew Dall and James Knotts as Arizona State Parks Law Enforcement Officers, contingent upon their successfully completing the CARLOTA training.
- 3. Consider Transferring the Unexpended Balance from the Maricopa County Trails Heritage Fund Project #680213, Goat Camp Trail Renovation to Trails Heritage Fund Project #689905, Goat Camp Extension/Acquisition** – Staff recommends increasing the grant award to Maricopa County for Trails Heritage Fund Project #689905, Goat Camp Extension/ Acquisition by \$6,337.90 to \$16,657.90. Staff will advise the Board as to the recommendation AORCC made at the April 14, 2005 meeting.

Chairman Stewart noted that, at the request of Mr. Ziemann, Agenda Item C.3. was being withdrawn.

Mr. Hays made a motion to approve Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2. Mr. Cordasco seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Ziemann needs to return to Phoenix to attend to matters at the legislature and moved to Agenda Item E.

E. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES – The Board and staff may discuss and the Board may take action on the following, if requested by the Board:

4. Legislative Update

Mr. Ziemann reported that he distributed a sheet detailing the status of bills of interest to the Board. Most of the bills he has been closely monitoring are dead, indicating that we are nearing the end of the legislative session. However, there are a few things that he needs to pay close attention to and needs to get back to the Valley rather quickly.

Mr. Ziemann noted that the most notable are HB 2764 (General Appropriations), HB 2773 (Environmental Protections), SB 1513 (General Appropriations) and SB 1522 (Environmental Protections) – all of which are budget bills. The House will hear their budget bills this afternoon. Amendments will be offered; exactly which amendments will be offered is unknown. One amendment staff hoped to have introduced was the elimination of the agency's out-of-state travel ban. For the past three years agency staff have been prohibited from traveling out-of-state. It has been an ongoing problem for the agency in a number of ways. Senator Linda Gray had offered to help eliminate that prohibition until Monday when her office called to say she was no longer willing to help pursue that issue. What had been looking positive now looks bleak. He explained that staff were hoping to clarify the issue with a draft of the new budget bill so that they could just leave out the non-appropriated part of the prohibition. That would have taken care of it with little or no notice. However, the two chambers decided to just reintroduce the entire budget package that the Governor vetoed. The prohibition was in that language. In order to remove it, an amendment is necessary either in the Appropriation Hearing to be held in three hours or on the Floor. Rumor has it that House leadership has provided the members with a list of amendment they would accept. It is doubtful whether this amendment is included on that list. There are members of the House who are still interested in putting something forward. He plans to be there to answer questions and round up some votes.

Mr. Hays asked why Senator Gray withdrew her support.

Mr. Ziemann responded that she gave him two reasons. The first was that she felt the budget for out-of-state travel that was submitted was excessive for the agency's 400+ employees. Secondly, she stated that she was uncomfortable in utilizing the non-appropriated funds (interest on the Heritage Fund and administrative money that comes from the State Lake Improvement Fund). He explained where that money comes from and that no grants would be pulled and that no grants would be denied because of this. It is administrative money. He told her that he would be happy to discuss a cap on the amount of travel. He suspects that the Senate leadership may be dictating what types of amendments they are willing to consider.

Mr. Ziemann noted that the Senate has not scheduled an Appropriations Hearing for their budget bills. This suggests that they probably do not have the necessary votes to get their package out. There are a lot of things up in the air regarding the budget.

Mr. Ziemann referred to SB 1067 (Zuni Water Rights Settlement). This bill came out of the Senate initially raiding \$4.6 million from the Game and Fish side of the Heritage Fund to pay for it. Representative O'Halleran stripped that raid in the House Natural Resources Committee, and put the onus back on the General Fund. It went through the Committee of the Whole House with the onus remaining on the General Fund. The Speaker then made a motion to amend the report to set aside Representative O'Halleran's motion and the Republicans fell in line. The bill now again raids the Heritage Fund of \$1.6 million. The Board takes any raid on the Heritage Fund very seriously. The Governor has offered to veto this bill if it comes up with a raid on the Heritage Fund; but it really puts her in a box because the Zuni water settlement is an important issue. That bill is still up in the air.

Mr. Ziemann also needs to work on HB 2180 (Spur Cross Ranch) this afternoon. The bill qualifies the acquisition and management of Spur Cross Ranch vis-à-vis what the original legislation said versus what actually occurred. The new bill would recognize the intergovernmental agreements and the conservation easements among Arizona State Parks Board, Maricopa County, and Cave Creek. It is becoming sticky because there was an amendment on the floor which says that access to Spur Cross Ranch cannot be changed without the approval of the State Parks Board. In and of itself, that amendment doesn't really do

anything. It is true as far as it goes, but to be completely accurate the access to Spur Cross Ranch can be changed without the approval of the Parks Board and Maricopa County and the Town of Cave Creek. That partnership is what made the acquisition and management of Spur Cross Ranch a tremendous success. Maricopa County, especially, is concerned about the perception that might arise with that amendment. The amendment either needs to be modified or completely taken off. He needs to be present for that amendment this afternoon to help get it back on track. Otherwise, Representative O'Halleran has vowed not to hold the Conference Committee, causing the bill to die and we will be working on Spur Cross Ranch again next session.

Chairman Stewart stated that she believes it is important to get that issue resolved. She has received some calls from members of the public expressing concern that the Board went ahead with that project without having the proper authority. They would like to have it cleaned up.

Mr. Ziemann responded that whether the bill ultimately passes or does not pass, the public is never going to know the difference as they are hiking through Spur Cross Ranch. The critical things for the management of Spur Cross are those conservation easements and the Intergovernmental Agreements. The problem is that they are not reflected in statute. Staff are trying to get that issue resolved – the sooner the better.

Chairman Stewart asked if, as of today, there is any attempt to sweep any of ASP's funds (i.e., SLIF or ASP Heritage Fund).

Mr. Ziemann responded that there has been no attempt to sweep the Board's Heritage Fund money. They are still talking about raiding SLIF for SB 1459 (River Reservoir Repair). It is very similar to what happened in the Zuni Water Rights bill. That bill is sitting and waiting to go to Rules. From there it would go to the Floor for debate. He is closely monitoring that bill. The amount of money it would entail is \$750,000.

Chairman Stewart noted that during the last few minutes both Mr. Porter and Mr. Winkleman arrived at the meeting.

F. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Strategic Plan

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Ziemann sent an E-mail to the Board that includes the same information that is posted on the board at the side of the meeting room.

Mr. Ziemann reported that he was asked to put what was done in context and the methodology involved. He noted that he was the facilitator for the discussions and would not need to be present during any discussion the Board engaged in regarding the meat of the information.

Chairman Stewart requested that Mr. Ziemann put it in context of the new Vision of being recognized locally and nationally as the best resource management agency. She also noted that over the last few months, and particularly at the last Board meeting, the Board discussed things they would like to see incorporated into the Strategic Plan. She asked the discussion to include how this may or may not relate to those two items.

Mr. Ziemann responded that a number of years ago Executive Staff was making more and more decisions. The concept at that time was to try to push some of that decision-making downward through the organization. As a result, "Big Staff" was created. It was comprised of the next layer of decision-making, leadership, and management within the agency. The Project 11 and Chapter 7 groups came out of Big Staff. Project 11 and Chapter 7 were very successful.

Mr. Travous added that the purpose of Big Staff was to involve more people to negotiate the things that were going on organizationally as well as providing those people in the organization who were the future leaders opportunity to add to the decision-making.

Mr. Ziemann noted that it resulted in better interaction between management levels within the organization.

Chairman Stewart explained that Chapter 11 was set up to meet the goal of bringing in \$11 million by a certain date through the Enhancement Fund. Chapter 7 was created to write the 7th chapter of ASP's history. A book was published a year or two ago that had six chapters on ASP. Chapter 7 was created after the

strategic planning of a year-and-a-half ago.

Mr. Ziemann reported that his part in this process was to take this group through a methodology, the purpose of which was to look at a problem and analyze it factually before starting to advocate a position. Participants read two cases. First, they were to put themselves in the place of a man named Frank Pace, Secretary of the Army. On July 27 (two days after the North Koreans invaded South Korea) you are asked to attend a meeting with President Truman and upper levels of the State Department and the military. The meeting is begun by the statement, "This is the 1930s all over again". What Harry Truman saw in the North Korean attack on South Korea was Hitler and Munich, the Japanese attacking China and Manchuria, the Italians in Ethiopia. In analyzing the conflicts of the 1930s and comparing them with the conflict in Korea, one finds that this was not a case of appeasement and aggression. A more appropriate analogy would have been the Spanish Civil War which was beyond the ability of the U.S. to control. In that room there were people with very disparate points of view. Their ability to speak out and make those kinds of cases, if you were Frank Pace, never materialized and you end up with a President who used nuclear weapons in the past drawing the U.S. militarily into this situation.

Mr. Ziemann stated that the second case the group looked at was a cessation case where they were asked to be in the place of British bankers who were considering whether to invest in the Baltimore-Ohio Railroad on eve of the Civil War. They were asked to analyze slavery, the Americans' ability to compromise, Lincoln – all these trends – to determine the proper action.

Mr. Ziemann noted that the key to both of these cases was not just that it's now 150 years later and we can look back and determine that decisions were made in error. The evidence and the data was there for them to analyze at the time. They analyzed it poorly. Those are the things staff are trying to avoid and do a better job in our current situation.

Mr. Ziemann stated that ASP's case would be the Strategic Plan. Regarding the Vision of the Board, as enunciated, staff are unsure specifically what it means and how to get to be the best resource management agency in the world. What does that mean? How do we get there? That is the problem and staff are trying to analyze the available information to get to those answers.

Mr. Ziemann noted that, similar to those two cases, we have disparate points of view within the agency. They were identified as: Activists (recreation and operations staff – those who are charged with the places we manage and operate), Idealists (resources management staff), and Pragmatists (staff whose job is dealing with funding and legislative issues). Quite frankly, everyone would prefer to be Idealists; however, job responsibilities necessitate being in various places within this triangle.

Mr. Ziemann explained that as this process progressed, staff were asked to think not just within their space in the triangle; everyone participated. The participants were a combination of members of Chapter 7 and Project 11 and Executive Staff. Twenty people participated. There were representatives of the Field, Executive Staff, and Section Chiefs.

Mr. Ziemann reported that he was asked to go through a scoping process of the issue – the Vision and where/how to proceed from here. The SCOPE was describing factually the Situation to begin with. Then they moved on to Concerns, Options or objectives, Premises, and Exclusions.

Mr. Ziemann explained that when describing the Situation, they discussed what was known. Then they moved on to what was unclear and then what presumptions are being made to be true. Most of the morning was spent trying to describe what the Situation was. Based upon those things, the group came up with some Concerns. They divided those Concerns into two categories: things necessary to be avoided and things that need to be attained. Based upon those things, they determined those things to be minimally avoided and minimally attained. They listed some Presumptions and some Exclusions. That was the context for the discussion.

Mr. Travous added that staff hope to take this discussion and provide the Board with a draft of the Strategic Plan that is based on these things at the May Board meeting and then fine-tune it and bring it to the July Board meeting for approval.

Chairman Stewart stated that her initial reaction is that things are not a whole lot farther along than a year ago when the Board received the report from Chapter 7. We appear to be at the same point of examining a lot of the questions of what should we do, what is needed, etc. It doesn't appear to her that there's been much movement. In fact, she understands that there were a few times that they were pulled off of their work. For a number of months nothing happened. Then there were notes from a meeting in February. Then a new group was constituted last Thursday that came up with this.

Mr. Travous responded that a lot of things have gone on, regardless of whether there's been movement or not. The things that are being presented here are what's happening in the agency. There are, as he tried to explain at the last meeting, questions that are coming up organizationally, including are we doing this or are we doing that. Rather than trying to advocate where we are going, we are trying to get a better understanding of what the concerns are within the organization and mold what we're doing toward the Vision. It's bigger than just words on a piece of paper. We are talking about changing the organizational culture. We are talking about going from one extreme (how much money we're making so we can make sure we can make it through this year) and moving over to another side.

Mr. Travous noted that the analogy that came up last week was that the train is pulling out of the station. We find ourselves, internally, making sure that we don't leave anyone in the organization behind. At the same time, we want to make sure that the tracks are laid so the organization doesn't crash. If that happens, then we should have left a lot of people behind. We are in that kind of situation. That does not, however, mean other things are not going on. We still have people working on PAMS; we still have people working on resources. One issue that came up here is that the agency is relying so much on technology. If we are going to continue to rely on technology, there are a lot of things that must be done. We can't only invest in technology; we need the manpower to do the work. The question comes up as to how do we know when we are making headway. It's a difficult question for staff to answer.

Chairman Stewart noted that in looking at the notes from the February 11 meeting, on page 12 of the Board packet, she wondered if a lot of the confusion on staff's part under Disadvantages of Changes was caused by the Executive Director advising staff that the Board desired to change to a Department of Conservation Vision as opposed to becoming the best resources management agency.

Mr. Travous responded that he did not believe that to be the case at all. Staff still look at the agency in the same way. He does not believe that is causing confusion. It has not slowed anything down. It doesn't matter to staff what the agency calls itself.

Chairman Stewart stated she is concerned, in looking some of the "Cons" that these things might be things people would be concerned about if the agency was changing from ASP to Department of Conservation. The Board never discussed depriving people of hunting or fishing or limiting site amenities or reining in the gift shop. She can see how Field Staff would be concerned if the Board were simply wanting to become a Department of Conservation. In her mind, and the minds of many in the community, it is something totally different from being ASP which now has recreation, some conservation, some cultural and historic preservation. If she were on the recreation side, she would be concerned about that. Since staff were all asked to send in something on what it would mean to become a Department of Conservation, she wondered if that was a problem. She asked if it has ever been clarified to staff.

Mr. Ziemann responded that he wanted to make some sense of what happened here. The entire discussion they had went from 9:00 a.m. until 3:00p.m. The "Department of Conservation" never even came up. At least at this level, that is not something that is overly burdensome or providing consternation among the upper levels of staff at ASP. One of the real benefits he saw in this exercise deals with the disparate points of view people have within the agency. This exercise helped build some consensus among upper staff to understand issues such as PAMS. The Idealists see PAMS as a tool and have grand aspirations for what it can do. The Activists view it with more skepticism – what actually will PAMS provide a Park Ranger in my park? The Pragmatists look at it and say, "Oh my goodness, this is going to cost us a fortune." We don't have the proper technology now to accomplish what the Idealists want. We don't even know, initially, what the questions we should be asking are so that we can properly build this PAMS system. In looking at just that one issue from disparate points of view, the value of doing something like this and analyzing it factually

caused the Idealists to have a better understanding of where the Pragmatists are coming from.

Mr. Ziemann added that everyone is still convinced that PAMS is critically important and is something that needs to be done. However, there is a better understanding now of the steps that will be required to move forward on that issue and actually create something tangible out of the Vision statement.

Mr. Porter stated that he agrees with what is being said. From analyzing the information he did detect that there was confusion over the idea that we were going to become a Conservation agency in name and hold ourselves out differently than a State Parks agency. He believes that is something that, frankly, none of the Board know whether it will occur. If it does, it will be a good ways down the road. It will be after the Board figures out what it wants to be and where it will go. At that time the Board will have to determine whether that's a step to take. He would like to see, at least for the time being, a squelching of additional discussions of a change in name. It does confuse, and it frightens some people and sends others off on the wrong road.

Mr. Travous responded that there is nothing in the Board's Vision Statement that gives the people on the recreational side of the agency comfort that we are going in their direction. There is nothing in the Board's current Vision Statement that says they are still part of the agency. This is not based upon the agency calling itself a Department of Conservation; this is based on answers coming from people. It comes from people last week trying to get into Lake Havasu in the middle of traffic jams and park staff wondering what this Vision means to them.

Mr. Porter noted that that might be the answer to this. It says very simply that we will strive to become the best managers. That would certainly include managing recreational parks and dealing with issues.

Chairman Stewart added that "resources" doesn't limit it to natural resources.

Mr. Porter added that, having said that, that is exactly why the responses were what they were. He believes that when the Board adopted that new Vision statement it really revolutionized this organization, as the Board intended. He has seen a change in focus and attitude and he likes that; it's exactly what he wanted to see. He is particularly delighted with PAMS. He sees that as the very first critical step. He doubts that the agency will be able to make any significant progress in too many other areas until we are over that hurdle. He doesn't believe there can be much movement toward becoming what the Board says it wants to become until a system like PAMS is in place where we can know what its assets and attributes are and be able to program it to market and manage them using it. In establishing that kind of system, the agency is probably putting itself way ahead of the pack nationally. He believes he and Ms. Stewart are in agreement that they don't want to see PAMS get out of focus; they want to see it progress steadily. He is satisfied with what he's been told that it is on track.

Chairman Stewart stated that she wanted to throw out some statements to see if they capture the context in which the Board adopted its Vision. She noted that in discussions with the Executive Director she was told staff are confused and concerned and better communication was needed as to what the Board is doing. She understands that the context of which the Board adopted this Vision was that they felt that in order to become respected and recognized as the best resource management agency, management of all the resources the Board has whether they be cultural, historic, natural or recreational, it needs to make its decisions on sound scientific and other factual information. In order to do that, there is a need for a tool like PAMS. In a layman's way of looking at it, the Board really wanted to apply the Kartchner Caverns State Park standard to everything it does. In other words, to carefully look at the facts before making decisions so we are fully aware of what effect the decisions will have on the resource. That doesn't mean that the Board is not going to have visitors or that it will not have recreation; rather, it means that the Board will make informed decisions based on facts.

Mr. Porter added that there are other things that the Executive Director and staff have done that he has to commend them on. He gets the feeling that the Board is really pushing staff so hard that they feel they aren't going as fast as the Board would like. He believes that the Board wants to see where staff are going and that the focus continues. One of the things that was touched on in the meeting when the Vision statement was crafted was converting how the agency approaches grants. He has been very pleased that staff are beginning to try to force the grants programs to be something other than something that

staff are merely administering and are starting to really analyze how it can be made a part of this overall management program and reach out and see that the things the Board is funding are being done. He's seen a lot of changes proposed in the Grant manuals. He is not at all unhappy. Yes, he would love to see the Board reach its Vision tomorrow. He knows he will not be on this Board when it gets there. The bottom line is that the agency is beginning to move in that direction.

Mr. Porter stated he liked what staff did with this process. All of these disparate elements were brought together and talked. They provided their input. Everyone was involved in that process and now have a feeling of being a part of it and of having been heard. Some of their ideas will ultimately have an impact. This is helpful, but he doesn't believe it will somehow provide a magic elixir that will show where this thing is going to go. He believes movement is already occurring. He does not believe the Foundation would exist had the Board not changed its Vision. He believes it was a direct offshoot of the Board looking at the fact that it needs financing in order to get where it wants to go.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that in reiterating the Strategic Plan from last year, it places natural and cultural resource protection on par with recreational resources. It says that you can't have one and have the other. There has to be some balance. He asked, in the explanation of the different meanings, if the Board considers it to be management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources. Right now, with the triangle, there is natural and cultural within recreational from one point of view. It is very difficult to determine when to say "No" to recreation versus when to say "No" to natural resources. Some staff interpret the new Vision to say natural resource first; recreation second. He believes that is causing some of the heated internal discussions that are currently going on.

Chairman Stewart responded that some of the resources have only recreational value at this point. Once they are turned into boat ramps, asphalt, etc., that's what they become. They are no longer a natural resource. She believes the Board purposely left the Vision open by saying "resource management" because she doesn't know that the Board wants to put words into it.

Mr. Siegwarth referred to the Strategic Plan and read from the Agency Focus.

Mr. Porter noted that he sees where this is going. He asked if staff thought adding the word "recreational" would help. He noted that it was never the Board's intention to exclude them from the Vision.

Mr. Travous responded that there is a need to get that message out. He noted that the dynamic is that the agency just came off three years of Project 11 where staff were working hard at finding ways to increase revenue. The Idealists felt they were not paid enough attention. Now they see the attention being paid to them more. The pendulum is swinging; the others feel they are being overlooked. A comment was made by the Idealists that, "They ruined Lake Havasu; we won't let them ruin another one." The Idealists are feeling more empowered. There is an internal situation occurring and the Board needs to know that all is not well in Mudville. As the Board tries to change the ship's direction, those who were at the bow now see themselves at the back of the ship. They need reassurance from the Board.

Chairman Stewart suggested that it might be helpful if she wrote a letter.

Mr. Ziemann noted that we are talking about where we will put our resources in the future; it's where the money will go. While it's empowering some, others feel left out. SHPO loves it because they now see they are a part of this, whereas they had no part in deriving revenue and felt left out during the Project 11 years. Now they have a chance to get additional resources in grants. The natural resources staff are very happy with it.

Chairman Stewart noted that it appears we are talking about a balance and a knowledge of what impact decisions will have on whatever resource is being looked at. She believes it really had more to do with the idea of making informed decisions based on sound information so that the Board can really decide if it wants to impact a resource.

Mr. Travous suggested that it would be helpful the Chairman bring a letter to the next Board meeting and have it read into the Minutes. He encourages people to read the Minutes of the Board meetings. Some, however, will read what they want to read into it. A letter of clarification from the Chairman will be helpful.

Chairman Stewart noted that it is sometimes difficult to read the Minutes while sitting at a computer. Some people don't have access to computers at the parks. The Minutes will be rather lengthy. She's not sure she would want to read it off the Minutes from a computer.

Mr. Siegwarth noted that because people do read the Minutes, he wanted to point out that what Brian Pendley and his staff and the staff at Lake Havasu have done is admirable. Most people only see a big parking lot. They haven't seen the nature trails, the landscaping around the campgrounds, the plans for the contact point, and the natural area. More people are recreating in a natural setting. He believes they have gone out of their way to embrace the Vision of being not only for recreation, but also natural and cultural resources.

Mr. Porter noted that now that Exec Staff have picked up on these vibes, they need to use their broad shoulders and handle it. That is what staff is about. The Board makes policy; they are the executives of the organization. Executive Staff now needs to decide how to deal with these now known vibrations and get people on the same page. It will entail putting some Band-Aids on some wounds where people feel they are threatened or are not prepared to make the change and try to make everyone understand where the Board is coming from. That is a challenge.

Chairman Stewart stated her belief that these things are really not inconsistent. There is a tendency to believe recreationists are on one side and conservationists on another side. When she did a lot of rock climbing and hiking, a real issue was that a resource can only handle so many people recreating, or doing anything, and when it reached its critical mass it lost its value. The Board has to protect all of its resources so they remain attractive. This is a statewide agency; there are a lot of people in the state with a lot of different interests and needs. At the very different parks the Board needs to have a wide range of things available. As she became more involved in some of these recreational things, she found how important it was to protect access to those properties and to protect the resource itself. At a certain point it is no longer fun if it can't be enjoyed.

Mr. Cordasco noted that it's swirling too fast to catch it. He is very interested in this discussion. He questions whether or not the Board has identified what its responsibilities and obligations are as a State Parks organization. That may be an area to be addressed under a discussion of this issue. We talk about the Vision, the Mission, etc. It's been a difficult task to get everyone to pull into it for one reason or another. Perhaps the common denominator is the responsibilities and obligations that the agency has to the people of Arizona. That is where his focus is right now. A wonderful quote he heard is, "If we first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do and how to do it" (Abraham Lincoln, 1858). Right now things appear a bit sketchy.

Chairman Stewart noted that it is important to take a look at what the law actually says. It would be good for the Board to re-examine it.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he appreciates the discussion about the Conservation Department. The Board needs to be careful regarding how thoughts are represented, but should certainly be very open to wherever all of this may lead and perhaps not have so much fear of change. He doesn't believe the Board wants to limit their thoughts. He believes the things that have been said and put in motion have a tremendous amount of potential and opportunity. The Board has a responsibility to that as well.

Mr. Porter stated he appreciated Mr. Cordasco's comments. He didn't want what he said earlier to be misinterpreted. His comment was to not push a name change so much but rather watch and see where things lead. He believes that it will probably lead in that direction; the Board needs to first decide what it really wants.

Chairman Stewart recessed the meeting at 9:58 a.m.

Chairmen Stewart reconvened the meeting at 10:08 a.m.

E. EXECUTIVE UPDATES

1. Riordan Presentation

Mr. John Schreiber, Park Manager, Riordan Mansion State Historic Park, reported that park staff are very excited to host the Historical Society reception Friday.

Mr. Schreiber reported that restoration of the building is progressing. Heritage Fund money in the amount of \$320,000 have been invested in the project. That project is just about complete. The roof between the two wings should be done shortly. They look forward to finishing up design plans on the new interpretive building.

Mr. Schreiber reported that they will host the SHPO Conference next year.

Mr. Schreiber reported that the park will host the Arizona Historical Society (AHS) Friday evening. They will offer tours Friday and Saturday to AHS at the group rate. They will also have some tours available between sessions of the History Convention on Saturday and Sunday.

Chairman Stewart stated the Board's appreciation for taking the time to meet with them this morning and all the work their staff have done to prepare for the reception and tours. It is a great opportunity for participants of the convention to learn more about Riordan Mansion and ASP. She noted that Mr. Travous personally donated the wine for the reception and will personally serve it.

6. Hopi Tribe

Chairman Stewart explained that a couple of years ago, after some discussions with Chairman Taylor and other members of the Hopi Tribe, the Board entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to accomplish three things: work on some joint marketing efforts to benefit both Homolovi State Park and the Tribe; integrate more Hopi interpretation into the park; and establish an internship at the park so Hopi members could become more familiar with how the Board operates its parks to help them set up a park system.

Mr. Ream reported that there have been three meetings since January. Those involved in the meetings include Ms. Bilbrey (ASP), Mr. Carroll Onsaie (Hopi Tribe), Velma _____ (Hopi Tribe), Janet Regnor (legal representative for Hopi Tribe), and himself. They are currently focusing their efforts on a marketing plan that includes strategies for creating a gateway at Homolovi State Park for visitors to Hopi. A second component they are focusing on is helping Hopi develop a park and recreation program so when those visitors go through the park gateway they have some place to go. The MOU provides for management guidelines, standards, and training. Staff are working with them on those components. The idea at this point is to help set up a small pre-commission to help set up a Park Commission in Hopi. A resolution will be brought to the Tribal Council in June. He introduced Mr. Carroll Onsaie.

Mr. Carroll Onsaie, representing the Hopi Tribe, addressed the Board. He stated he is present as a representative of Chairman Wayne Taylor. He read a statement from Chairman Taylor. "I am terribly sorry I am unable to attend today's meeting. Please do not interpret my absence as an indication that I am less than enthused about the proposed Joint Management Agreement of Homolovi between the State of Arizona and the Hopi Tribe. I am, in fact, very excited and supportive of the plan. Cultural and archaeological preservation of Homolovi is of crucial importance to the Hopi people. The Hopi Tribe is very appreciative of the working relationship established by the State Parks staff. The Tribe also is impressed with the staff's draft marketing plan. It is the intention of the Hopi Tribe to pursue a joint management marketing strategy, establishment of a Hopi Parks Board, and training and development of Hopi Parks personnel. The Tribe is seriously considering the creation of a Hopi Parks Board in the near future. The Hopi Tribe's Land Team also intends to visit Kartchner Caverns on May 13, 2005 to see firsthand how Homolovi might be developed. Please let me know if there is any way I can be of assistance in advancing this project. Thank you. Wayne Taylor, Jr., Chairman/CEO, The Hopi Tribe."

Mr. Onsaie added that the Hopi Tribe is very appreciative of the involvement and commitment the ASP personnel have demonstrated so far. Some significant gains have been made at these meetings. Because of the importance of the MOU to the Tribe, they will be pursuing the project vigorously. They do plan to address some issues with the Tribal Council in June to help them to proceed in this direction. He thanked Mr. Ream and Ms. Bilbrey. They look forward to future involvement with the Parks Board.

Chairman Stewart thanked Mr. Onsaie for his remarks and stated that on behalf of the Board, she appreciated the efforts that the Hopi Tribe have put forth, and particularly Chairman Taylor has been very generous with his time. The Board certainly understands that he has other responsibilities. The Board looks forward to seeing him at a future time and to continuing to work with the Tribe.

Mr. Ream noted that the Visitor's Center at Kartchner Caverns State Park (KCSP) is really the gateway to the cave. It establishes the appreciation and sensitivity of the cave. Staff want to create an appreciation and sensitivity for Hopi culture at Homolovi so when and if those visitors visit the Mesas they have that in mind. Another place staff would like to visit is Edge of the Cedars, an archaeology park just outside of Arizona in Utah. It is a great example of archaeology in the wilderness that is subtle. Because the artifacts are so subtle, interpretation is key to creation of that appreciation and sensitivity.

D. ACTION ITEMS – The Board may take action on the following items:

- 1. Cross Creek Home Owners Association Access to Red Rock State Park** – Staff recommends that the Executive Director take all steps necessary to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the Cross Creek Community Association to provide restricted access to Red Rock State Park for residents of the Cross Creek Subdivision with a valid Arizona State Parks Standard Annual Entrance Pass. No agreement would be valid until fully executed by both parties and no access to the Park would be allowed prior to the construction of a trail extension within the park to the gate.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board received a draft agreement a few months ago and suggested a number of changes. She spoke with Ms. Boland, representing the Attorney General's Office, regarding two sentences in the same paragraph that appear to be inconsistent. Ms. Boland will present a proposed change to clarify it.

Mr. Ream reported the issue here is one more of precedence than of problem. This subdivision is just outside of Red Rock State Park. They would like a trail access into the park. He visited the site yesterday. It is approximately 10 yards. It would not be far from the park's trail. Every household in the subdivision would purchase an Annual Pass that would be part of their annual HOA fees. He noted that the HOA has not seen this contract yet. Cachet Homes is no longer the majority stakeholder in the HOA. Prior to December they still owned the majority of the lots, which gave them the majority of the votes in the HOA. It has since been turned over to the HOA. Mr. Shelly represents Cachet Homes and will probably turn this agreement over to the HOA for their approval.

Ms. Boland reported the recommended change to the draft agreement is on page 7 of the Board packet, item #8, Binding Effect; Termination. Chairman Stewart suggested the agreement be terminable by either party with 30 days' notice. That change had previously been made but created an inconsistency with the last sentence of that paragraph which says, "Unless earlier terminated by the written agreement of the parties . . ." There is an ability for either party to unilaterally terminate the agreement. She proposed striking "the written agreement of the parties" and inserting "either party". That last sentence will read, "Unless earlier terminated by either party this Agreement automatically shall terminate . . ."

Chairman Stewart stated that the other change is to the motion. She noted that the Board have discussed that this is an important agreement in terms of the precedent and the policy it sets. The Board do not want to just give *de facto* delegation to staff. She feels that the motion should be changed, if the Board desires to approve this agreement, to limit it to this agreement; if further negotiations take place it would have to come back to the Board. This is the kind of thing that could lead to the sort of litigation the Board had with the Maberys. One of the changes she suggested earlier on was to remove "easement". There is no longer any reference to any easement or license, or anything of that nature. She understands that the people who are actually performing the maintenance are a commercial entity paid for by the HOA. There really wasn't a need to establish a provision that might attach to the land. The motion for approval would relate to this agreement as opposed to any other version of the agreement.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Jim Shelly was present to address the Board. Mr. Shelly has followed the Board around the state. He addressed the Board in Florence a few months ago and has been very diligent in pursuing this agreement. It has taken the Board a while to refine it, but that is because of the importance of

this kind of agreement and the Board's desire to ensure everyone interprets it the same way so there are no disagreements or unhappiness with it in the future.

Mr. Jim Shelly, Cross Creek Ranch/Cachet Homes, addressed the Board. He stated that Cachet Home developed a 217 acre property in Yavapai County called Cross Creek Ranch that is immediately adjacent to the south of Red Rock State Park and shares a common boundary with the park. During the development of the subdivision, they controlled the Homeowners Association. They have sold out the subdivision and it is literally completely owned by private third parties at this point. Therefore, they turned control of the HOA to the individual lot owners within Cross Creek Ranch. In doing so, they did identify that they were working with staff at ASP to finalize this agreement for going on two years and wanted the Board to give them the ability to finalize this agreement. They are aware of the agreement; they are aware that discussions are continuing with staff. They are looking forward to the opportunity to execute the agreement on behalf of the HOA.

Mr. Shelly noted that they are trying to accomplish three things with this agreement. Cross Creek Ranch and Red Rock State Park share a two-mile irrigation ditch that was hand-dug by the Armijo family in the early 1900s. The ditch is approximately two miles long, with one mile on Red Rock State Park and one mile on Cross Creek Ranch. Cross Creek Ranch is the terminance of the irrigation ditch. Therefore, historically the owners of Cross Creek Ranch have had the obligation to maintain this ditch. One of the things they are trying to do in this agreement is document that obligation for the entire two miles of the Armijo ditch. Historically, the property manager employed by the family who owned Cross Creek Ranch would periodically walk along the ditch, clean the debris, and ensure the flow was maintained. This ditch, because it is earthen, leaks and helped create the riparian area. He believes it is mutually beneficial to both the park and the HOA that this obligation be documented so it is just not, "That's the way it's always been."

Mr. Shelly stated that, in addition to documenting the maintenance obligation of the Armijo ditch, they feel that there is a benefit to Red Rock State Park in giving them the opportunity to attend the HOA's annual meetings to maintain an open forum on communication. Often disagreements among neighbors happen. It is stated in the agreement that they would like the Park Manager to be invited to the annual meetings. Even though there is only one house there now, a lot of people do come because they have a substantial investment in their lot. Most of the lot owners do plan on building on their lot at some time in the future.

Mr. Shelly stated that they feel the benefits of the document are the ability to document the maintenance of the ditch and the ability to create an open forum between the Park Manager and the HOA management. For those reasons, they asked the Board to create an Action Item this morning authorizing the Executive Director or his designated official to enter into this agreement with the Cross Creek Ranch HOA.

Mr. Porter stated his appreciation in Mr. Shelly's attendance at this meeting and the work that has been done on the agreement. He stated that he was ready to make a motion. He asked whether staff were comfortable with the change to the agreement as put forth by Ms. Boland.

Mr. Ream responded they were.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Executive Director take all steps necessary to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the Cross Creek Community Association to provide restricted access to Red Rock State Park for residents of the Cross Creek Subdivision with a valid Arizona State Parks Standard Annual Entrance Pass. No agreement would be valid until fully executed by both parties, and no access to the Park would be allowed prior to the construction of a trail extension within the park to the gate. Any modification to the proposed agreement presented to the Board at its meeting of April 21, 2005 must be brought back to the Board for approval.

Mr. Winkleman seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalzo asked if this is a gated community.

Mr. Shelly responded affirmatively.

Mr. Scalzo asked how many units have been built and how many people are currently living there.

Mr. Shelly responded that at this point in time there was an existing residence on Lot 52 that still exists. He is not aware of any other existing residences at this point in time. There is one other residence that is very close to completion. There are a number of residences (six or so) that are going through the architectural process and approval process prior to construction.

Mr. Scalzo asked staff where else in the park system something like this is done.

Mr. Travous responded it is not done anywhere else.

Chairman Stewart stated it is done to some extent at the Sonoita Creek Preserve.

Mr. Travous noted that it is not being done yet. The Board has not yet entered into any agreement on that property.

Chairman Stewart noted that park encroaches that property and that it's part of the plan as she understands it.

Mr. Porter noted that this agreement will set the precedent the Board can use.

Mr. Scalzo asked how staff plans to address this in the numerous parks in upcoming years. Will there be gates and entrances all over the place. He asked how that will benefit the park system insofar as securing the areas and issues relating to public protection.

Mr. Travous responded that this is a precedent. Staff still have to worry about people coming in after hours. There are concerns about people who are in the park trying to get into the gated community. Staff do have those anxieties.

Chairman Stewart noted there is a clause in the agreement that states the Board has no responsibility. The reason she suggested there be a 30 days period whereby either party could get out of the agreement is that if it turns out to be unworkable on either side the agreement can terminate. It is uncharted territory. If it turns out the park ends up with a lot of trash or people start bringing in their dogs despite signs posted to the contrary, the Board can reconsider its position.

Mr. Shelly noted that they share those concerns as well. They looked at a lot of different ways to control pedestrian access not only to the park but also to the private property. They felt by creating a controlled access that is locked and has the park's rules posted at that point of access, people would be more aware. They want to provide a heightened awareness of the residents of Cross Creek that the park is a controlled access as well. They will buy a pass, go through this gate. Gained access is the opportunity for their residents to go through a trail system from Cross Creek instead of having to drive over the bridge, go into the parking lot, and use their pass at the park entrance. Why make that trip if all they want to do is hike in the park.

Mr. Porter noted that he had a lot of the same concerns initially. He also realized that the Board will have to confront this issue in the not-too-distant future at Sonoita Creek. This is much more controlled. It will be a great experiment to see what happens and what the issues are. He believes the Board will be better able to decide whether this is something they will have to rethink. He believes it will work; but it will be interesting to watch.

Chairman Stewart asked what the maintenance cost is for the ditch.

Mr. Shelly responded that they initially budget about \$12,000 within the Cross Creek Ranch Homeowners Association. With the extremely wet weather they received, the current maintenance annualized for the season is exceeding \$24,000-\$25,000. They have had to rebuild the diversion bank three times; there's been huge washouts along the banks of ditch that had to be repaired. That is not considered normal.

Chairman Stewart asked the length of the feeder trail to the main trail from the gate.

Mr. Ream responded that he estimated it to be a few feet. He was standing at the gate's site and could see the trail through the trees.

Chairman Stewart asked if there is a Homeowners Association in place and whether they have any rules in place.

Mr. Shelly responded that there is a Homeowners Association in place that is controlled by lot owners of Cross Creek Ranch. They have their own rules and regulations as all HOAs must abide by as well as Bylaws, Articles, architectural designs, and other documents that address virtually everything that can be addressed. Dogs must be leashed. He can provide staff with the rules and regulations.

Chairman Stewart asked if the design guidelines or other rules prohibit the homeowners from having gates of their own leading onto park property.

Mr. Shelly responded that that was addressed in the design guidelines. They cannot do that. Additionally, they have taken legal steps to address it as well.

Mr. Ream added that staff worked with the landowners at the time and participated in a number of meetings. Staff would have liked to have purchased the property and made it part of the park. The money wasn't there. They have done a great deal to ensure that they are good neighbors. He added that there are parks in the system where there are numerous entrances and there will be problems down the road. There are more and more houses coming in the area around Catalina State Park, and it's becoming an urban setting. These are trails that the park developed. Many of the trails go out to the area that has become Rancho Vistoso. They are all access points to Catalina State Park now. More and more houses are going in.

Chairman Stewart noted that none of the Board members are entirely comfortable with the idea of having these additional gates; but, on the other hand, looking at the practicalities of what happens if we don't take proactive steps there could be a worse situation. The Board is receiving some benefits. Everyone has to buy an Annual Pass. This is not a special pass; it is the \$45 pass. There will not be any issues of who did or did not buy a pass. They must buy a pass for every home regardless of whether they use it or not. They are providing the maintenance of the ditch which she understands would be a legal obligation of the Board if it were not for this agreement.

Mr. Ream agreed that it is on the park's property. If it wasn't done through this agreement, it would have to be done through another agreement. The ditch is a benefit to the park and staff would prefer to not maintain it. We don't have that kind of staff.

Chairman Stewart noted that there are differences in this agreement as opposed to whether it would necessarily obligate the Board for everyone who might ask for two homes here or six homes there.

Mr. Ream added that they eliminated horses from the subdivision.

Chairman Stewart called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried with Mr. Scalzo voting Nay.

Mr. Scalzo stated his wish to explain his vote. He stated that he felt the Board is establishing a dangerous precedent for the park system. The last thing the Board wants is a road through the park so they can develop their facilities. He's not saying this particular group is doing the wrong thing. He is saying that he doesn't believe in it. He also has a problem with this because there is no public access. It is just for a select group of people who happen to be able to afford very expensive property next to the park. The reason the property is expensive is because of the Board and staff operating the park system. The Board is rewarding that by giving them special treatment.

Mr. Porter noted that he needed to leave the meeting at this time for another commitment. He noted that the Board would be taking up the issue of the Sedona Fire District shortly. The Board is not being asked to vote on anything today. If it comes down to a philosophical discussion, he would like the Board to know he is philosophically in favor.

Mr. Porter left the meeting at 10:48 a.m. A quorum of the Board was maintained.

E. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES

7. Sedona Fire District

Mr. Ream reported that great strides have been made with the MOU for the Sedona Fire District. The MOU is about a year-and-a-half old, even though it was only supposed to go for a year. There was staff turnover last summer as well as a number of other issues that resulted in this project being placed on a back burner. In a discussion with Chief Shoebert in January it was noted that nothing had been done on the MOU in some time and that it had changed due to the Forest Service no longer being a part of the MOU. The time limit of five years is too short for them and they are no longer interested in this facility. At one time the discussion was for three acres; it is now down to one acre. Chief Shoebert was asked to put a feasibility plan together to show what it would look like, whether or not it is feasible, hiring the engineers to see whether the power, water and the things that are necessary to run a fire station on ASP property are there. A part of the MOU that has not been done is the public involvement process. Staff still need to provide the Board with a written recommendation that includes proposals for the sharing of expenses and all practical and financial constraints. This is not the end of that MOU. He noted that a copy of the study was provided to the Board in the Board packet. Staff are not requesting action today.

Chairman Stewart noted that she had a few things she would like Chief Shoebert to address. She noted that originally there were a number of benefits that were enumerated to the Board. The original plan was that the fire department would possibly absorb the cost of a new wastewater treatment plant. There was talk about a multi-use building that would be shared by the fire department, Forest Service, and ASP that might be a combination Visitor Center/Firehouse with a place where visiting rangers could stay over. There was also, of particular interest to her, the potential of the Forest Service donating some of their land to the park so the Board would not end up with a net loss. She noted that upwards of 70% of the calls originate at the park. This would provide for a faster response without the need for park staff to be as involved with EMT activities. She asked Chief Shoebert to include in his comments why the Board should still be interested in the changed plan.

Mr. Matt Shoebert addressed the Board. He thanked the Board for allowing him the opportunity to address this issue. He noted that the direction has changed a bit over the past year-and-a-half.

Mr. Ream noted that it complicated things for the Operations section. He didn't really want to see the visitor center on top of a fire station. He thought of it as a "sweetener" for the Board. He didn't like that particular idea. He believes the park's facility should be separated in that nature. There was also discussion of sharing a dormitory. Again, he believes that ASP should be responsible for its own staff. There were later discussions on a better method of sharing that included possibly creating a lease/fee and using proceeds from those funds to make those improvements and thereby own them ourselves. He felt that sharing quarters or facilities with another agency would be very complicated. He removed those items from the table and requested that the discussion be the fire station and the park. He reiterated that the size decreased from a three-acre to a one-acre operation. It's a much smaller footprint than originally intended. He believes that smaller, in this case, is better for moving the process forward.

Mr. Shoebert stated that, according to the architects, it certainly is feasible. Other tangible benefits to ASP are an improved roadway infrastructure that would be built, an additional entrance, widening of the current entrance, and other things that would be of benefit to the trolley system such as utilizing the fire department's ingress/egress. Additional benefits would be more security to the park and possibly a revenue source. He noted that in the drawing the building looks larger than it actually is. The entire footprint is under 4,000 square feet, including the spaces where the fire apparatus would be parked. The architecture follows the theme of the park and blends nicely into the park.

Mr. Shoebert stated there are a number of benefits to the fire district. Currently they house their staff at Indian Gardens. That facility is undersized and the lease expires in another four years. They would like to find long-term solutions. Strategically, Slide Rock State Park is in the center of Oak Creek Canyon, giving them quicker response opportunity up and down. The area has experienced more rainfall this year than over the past four or five years. That has created a different set of problems. They are now seeing an undergrowth that can cause a huge wildland fire problem. This would put them in the epicenter of where their largest evacuation would be.

Mr. Hays noted that the building is going to be 4,000 square feet. It doesn't look very big for a growing area.

Mr. Shoebert responded that their studies indicate that the growth in the area has pretty much stabilized. There are 430+ private property owners in the Verde Canyon, and it is pretty much built out for the most part. They believe that a smaller station such as this will fit their needs for the next 50 years.

Mr. Scalzo asked where the nearest fire station is.

Mr. Shoebert responded it is at Indian Gardens, approximately four miles south of the park.

Mr. Shoebert asked if, because they primarily perform EMT, they need a fire engine there.

Mr. Shoebert responded that they would. They are proposing a water tanker, a small fire truck (type 3 engine like the Forest Service uses), an ambulance, and a golf cart to respond throughout the park for those calls originating in the park so it wouldn't be so intrusive to the visitors. Optimally, they would like a fire truck there.

Mr. Scalzo asked if they have an alternate site.

Mr. Shoebert responded negatively.

Mr. Scalzo asked if they investigated an alternate site.

Mr. Shoebert responded that they checked with the Forest Service about some potential locations. Private property is not currently available in Oak Creek – certainly private affordable property is not readily available. The Forest Service does have a couple of parcels – one of which is across the creek that would entail some bridge issues. The majority of the Forest Service's properties are on steep slopes, making them nonviable options.

Chairman Stewart asked if the Board would have any kind of guarantee that there would not be a request to increase the size down the road. Her initial concern was that the Board would be giving up some of its very limited land. When the discussions were about a three-way deal, the idea was that the Board would make up any losses, and perhaps gain land, by having the Forest Service involved. She would hate to have a situation where there is a foot in the door and then receive a lot of public and political pressure to double the size.

Mr. Shoebert responded that it would be based on ASP's recommendation.

Chairman Stewart asked if the station at Indian Gardens would continue to be maintained.

Mr. Shoebert responded that their plan would be to let that lease go when it expires.

Chairman Stewart asked what would happen if there is an increase in the population to the south.

Mr. Shoebert responded that, based on population, the location of Slide Rock and their additional stations located in uptown Sedona are adequate for that type of community. They don't anticipate needing any other stations. This would fit their long-range plans for the entire Oak Creek Canyon.

Chairman Stewart referred to the picture of the water tank. She asked if that tank is there because of a lack of a water source.

Mr. Ream responded that it is for wastewater. That will be one of the cost-sharing aspects they would discuss. We have to solve our sewage problem, whether we bring in 200 portable toilets through the summer or in some other way. Building a wastewater treatment plant is not a big problem; money could be found to do it. Wherever effluent is put along a creek like that is where the biggest problem lies. The tank is for collection of their sewage. That may be something staff will look at in the future. Visitation at Slide Rock State Park is 250,000 over the summer.

Chairman Stewart suggested that the tank be camouflaged.

Chairman Stewart asked how sirens will be handled.

Mr. Shoebert responded that they have agreements in other neighborhoods where they have stations whereby they do not turn on the sirens or lights until they are through the gate or further down the road. They will abide by whatever is agreed upon with staff.

Chairman Stewart asked if there is any impact on the water table.

Mr. Shoebert responded that generally the only time they would need to pull water out from the creek would be for a catastrophic fire. They generally hook up to a fire hydrant for house fires. Pulling from the creek would be limited to an emergency type situation.

Chairman Stewart asked if staff see any detrimental impact to the resource.

Mr. Ream responded that the park currently fills what is known as a “pumpkin” every year from the park’s water source. It is a dip tank used by helicopter crews from the Forest Service. The park has been providing water for firefighting activities in that area. The park is also the only flat spot in that canyon and is the base of activity for any fires that occur there. It is ironic that the fire station looks at the park as a potential site. If there is a fire there, that two-lane road is closed in order to bring in equipment and crews. The park is closed whenever there is a fire in the canyon because it becomes a base of operations for fighting fires in that area.

Mr. Hays asked what the current situation is for emergency medical treatment.

Mr. Travous responded that the agency generally tries to have EMTs on-site at the park. Because EMT’s often leave the agency after receiving their training, he does not know if there is one at that park currently.

Mr. Ream added that the agency is currently having issues with its EMT program. Every EMT has to be backed by a local hospital as part of their training and part of their authorization to use their EMT skills. The agency actually eliminated its EMT program for that reason – no hospitals would back it. Now hospitals are beginning to back it again, so some of the EMT programs are being reinstituted in the rural parks. The agency’s EMTs would go down, but before they could even get down to stabilize someone was calling 911 to bring paramedics in.

Mr. Shoebert stated that they have certified paramedics – two of whom would be housed at this station.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Executive Director has expressed concerns in the past about the precedent in doing something like this. She asked for him to voice his concerns. This is an important issue and, obviously, nothing that will be resolved today. She believes the Board should carefully weigh the pros and cons and extended the opportunity to him to tell the Board his thinking.

Mr. Travous stated that he does have some concerns. He admitted that his initial reaction was somewhat knee-jerk. The knee-jerk comes from being constantly approached by people wanting to do something on the parks because it’s the easiest place to go to. He noted that he has 20+ years dealing with the Forest Service, and the way they prevented this from happening is by making it so absolutely administratively impossible for people that they simply give up. They have a saying that, “Only the best, best, best, best ideas come on the Forest Service because we kill them through our processes.” He has had some time to qualify his reaction. He understands the need for something to happen in that area. Fire is a big issue in Arizona; and it doesn’t ever go away. If the trees aren’t burning, the underbrush is. At the same time, as we look at putting the station down toward the end of the park, the visual enjoyment of the park is removed. At one time there was the benefit of having a place for the park staff to live; now that’s been removed. He noted that the size has been dramatically reduced, probably out of necessity. He would like the opportunity to explore other places where it might happen. Two potential sites come to mind. He noted that their lease runs out in four years.

Mr. Shoebert added that that lease in Indian Gardens is with a private owner. They actually do own a 40’ square portion of that property; however only half of one of the engine bays sits on that property. Staying there is not a viable solution.

Mr. Travous asked if they could get a lease extension.

Mr. Shoebert responded that he certainly did not want to say this site is the only option for them. However, they have identified this property as the most effective and efficient spot for them because of the location and the number of emergencies in that area.

Mr. Travous stated that he believed that there a couple of places he would like to explore. One of those places is still on ASP’s property there. Because the plans for the station are so reduced in size, he would like

to explore a place the agency owns across the highway that would solve some of the problems. The physical dimensions fit for that site across the highway. It's a cheaper property. It is outside of the recreational area. It is right there on the highway. There may be other problems with it that he's not aware of. He would like to work with the fire department to see if something else will work. He has reviewed the study and feels the design is very appropriate and will blend in. He still has that gut level concern about putting facilities that are not park facilities inside the parks. He would like to see if there is another alternative.

Chairman Stewart responded that she felt that is a point well taken. She traveled in Newfoundland several years ago where they received a lot of pressure from their Parliament to sell parts of some of their parks. They were forced to sell part of a beautiful park surrounded by a lake. On entering the park there was the most garish miniature golf course she'd ever seen right on the hill. It destroyed the whole park. While we're talking about something different here, the question is where does one draw the line. If the Board starts looking at this as a commercial lease, will the legislature then say there's no money for the system – why don't you lease space to McDonalds. She thinks that the Board has to be careful in how it approaches this and, if it does something, how it justifies it without it turning into something snowballing into commercialization of the parks. The reason people go to the parks is for peace, recreation, etc.

Mr. Winkleman noted that that park does generate a lot of emergencies. It is probably a good idea for staff to explore other options to see if we can't come up with something.

Chairman Stewart stated the Board's appreciation of Chief Shoenert's efforts in this project and for taking the time to visit with the Board. The plan is very impressive. He's been very good to work with in terms of being willing to consider all of the Board's suggestions. If this project comes to fruition the Board has no doubt the fire district will be a good neighbor. It's a good beginning.

F. DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. State Trust Land

Mr. Winkleman reported that a couple of bills were introduced in the legislature; both of them died. Neither actually got very far. There have been significant efforts during the last two legislative sessions for reform. He believes that the message of the importance of what the State Land Department (SLD) is doing is being understood by people. They got a sizable boost to their budget in both the Governor's version and the legislative version. People are beginning to recognize the need for funding. That doesn't solve the problem as it relates to reform. The reform is not happening in the legislature. He believes people are questioning whether it ever will.

Mr. Winkleman stated that the stakeholders who have been involved in this process for the past several years are still talking. He knows of at least one group that is working towards an initiative. The SLD is not actively participating in that effort, but do provide information to anyone when requested. He believes something will come forward. He suspects something will go directly to the voters in November 2006. In order for that to happen, money needs to be raised and signatures need to be gathered. It takes time. If an initiative is formed, it will happen within the next six months. The Board will then have a good idea of what it will say.

Mr. Winkleman stated that he knows of one group of stakeholders that is meeting to come up with a package that it can take to the citizens. This group has picked up from where they left off a year ago. A year ago a coalition came together with a comprehensive package. The SLD played an active role in that coalition. There was about 700,000 acres of land throughout the state to be classified for conservation in one form or another. There were variations. The most basic theme was that some of them were going to be set aside as permanent open space up front while others would carry a classification where they would be made available for purchase under certain terms that included matching funds. Those concepts have been picked up by this group. He doesn't know whether they have maps that they are working on that look similar to the maps the coalition had before. He has been told that almost all, if not all, of what was on the maps for ASP shows up on these maps in one form or another. Again, that's a combination of things that might be set aside up front and lands that would have to be purchased. He believes that the good news for ASP is that the message is getting through. He doesn't know to what extent staff have been communicating with the

conservation groups.

Mr. Travous responded that staff have been asked for the maps that were included in the Board packet.

Chairman Stewart added that she has been included on some conference calls and has spoken with some legislators and they are aware of ASP's needs.

Mr. Winkleman stated that the good news is that the message appears to be getting through. Virtually all of the lands in one area are being addressed by this group. He cannot say whether this group will be successful. It does involve some stakeholders who have been very active the past few years.

Mr. Winkleman noted that the financial challenges are significant. Some of the land potentially set aside as conservation land is not expensive, such as the land around Homolovi State Park. However, the land around Catalina State Park is more urban and will be quite expensive to purchase. The good news is that people are still working to address this problem and ASP appears to be handled well. However, there will be some substantial financial challenges at some of the parks if this process goes forward.

Chairman Stewart noted that very little of this would be free.

Mr. Winkleman responded that this group has about 700,000 acres total that is not 50/50 but perhaps 40/60 of which 40% would be without compensation and 60% would be with compensation. He does not know what the situation is in terms of specific leased lands.

Chairman Stewart stated that she hasn't gotten any sense that anyone will be advocating moving ASP up to a higher category.

Mr. Winkleman agreed and stated that he believes the perception is that ASP might have a funding source. The legislature may someday choose to make them a priority. There is a perception that at least there is some possibility. Others say there is no possibility.

Chairman Stewart stated her concern that if the Board sits around and waits until 2006 to see if something goes through and don't try to find out how it will acquire properties it may end up either priced out of the market or without some of these lands essential for maintaining the integrity of the existence of the parks.

Mr. Winkleman agreed that it is a problem. His agency's mission is to maximize revenue for the benefit of the Trust. ASP may have to compete for some of the land it wants.

Mr. Hays asked if information on this group is privileged. Staff need to know who they should go see.

Mr. Winkleman responded that he didn't know that it's private. He is not aware of a formal group or organization. Even in last year's coalition, while many groups showed up there was no one body that spoke for the group. They all had their own ideas. It is difficult to speak with one voice in that type of group. The conservation community was lumped together as a stakeholder, yet there are more than 100 different conservation groups in the state and they all have different missions and they are interested in different parts of the state. It was not possible to say that the conservation community spoke with one voice – they did not.

Mr. Hays noted that there are major differences among the major conservation groups.

Mr. Winkleman suggested that now is the time to make contact. Ideas are being formed in terms of the classification of the land, decisions are being made, and they will have to go forward within the next six months. He suggested that the Board's most immediate course of action be to participate to the fullest extent possible with the people providing input, looking at the maps, reminding people that ASP is not a funded agency and the legislature is not showing a tendency to fund Capital projects, and putting forth the thought that somehow designating these areas as parks will mean that they will be preserved.

Chairman Stewart asked how the agency acquired land prior to API.

Mr. Winkleman responded it depended on the circumstances. The Board could try to acquire the lands around Oracle utilizing a funding source. These lands designated for acquisition for open space will be done in a way that they result in an appraised value with that option. To the extent Board has money and wants to do something with it, the Board needs to find locations where it is more likely to succeed in an

option scenario. Land situated in certain areas will not be attractive to others. The Board will need to look at circumstances and make the decision whether or not to be proactive in acquiring everything on its wish list. He noted that there are ways to configure land that make it perhaps useful for some uses and less useful for other uses. For example, if it doesn't fit as land trust, they could acquire properties and carve up chunks that were bite sized for them. There are a host of issues out there. The SLD will entertain looking at areas the Board wants to acquire. They are in the business of having successful transactions. They would have to look at how much it would cost.

Chairman Stewart suggested that it might be helpful for ASP staff to meet with Land Department staff and go through the list to determine if the Board could go forward on some of these properties without much risk and determine others that emphasis should be put on trying to have them positioned on whatever the initiative might be. The conservation community has been splintered over the last year. She is not sure if something will pass or not. She would hate for the Board to sit and wait until November 2006 and then try to determine its options. The Board needs to know now what its options are. Patagonia Lake is a high priority for the Board because of the scenic backdrop.

Mr. Winkleman noted that Patagonia has an access issue with a ranch.

Chairman Stewart noted that there is a good deal of this land that the Board would want as open space. Some would qualify for Natural Areas money; some would not.

Mr. Travous noted that, regarding the Patagonia property, the issue revolves around the Circle Z Ranch. They have a prescriptive easement over most of those lands for horse trails. Several years ago the Board was on the cusp of purchasing that land when that issue arose. There was actually a land exchange with the SLD. As he recalls, there was an insurance problem. Everyone withdrew from that purchase because of the legal entanglements at that point in time.

Chairman Stewart suggested that ASP staff get together with the SLD staff. Since both agencies share attorneys, get some legal advice on what the implications would be of the Board going forward with this issue and what it would mean.

Mr. Travous noted that land exchange was a possibility under the land reform. He asked if that will again be the case.

Mr. Winkleman noted that he is not personally involved with this group. He suspected that it won't be. The Sierra Club has expressed concerns about exchanges. He believes people will try to come up with something that does not have active or funded opposition.

Mr. Travous noted that in the past the agency has been able to get the federal government to exchange key areas with the SLD. ASP would apply to the federal government through the Recreation for Public Purposes Act and pick up those properties and add them to the state's parks. Other public entities have done that. In their zest for crippling the SLD's ability they have crippled ASP's ability to make those land exchanges.

Chairman Stewart requested a report at the next meeting.

E. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES

2. Verde River Greenway Presentation

Chairman Stewart noted that on Wednesday she had the opportunity to see some outstanding land that may be available to the Board. A lot of things are happening that the Board will need to pay some attention to in the next couple of months. She noted that Mr. Castillo has maps and photographs to share with the Board.

Mr. Max Castillo, Manager, Verde River Greenway, reported that the Greenway started as a concept in 1983 with the Verde River Green Corridor Project. A group of people formed to limit public access along the Verde River in Verde Valley. They bought up all the different points that were available. He referred to a map and pointed out those areas. He stated that the long-and-short of it is that in 1983-1987 it was a good idea to set up a preserve and protect that area. In 1986 Governor Babbitt met with ASP and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) to work on a six-mile region, the Verde River Greenway. It extended from the Tuzigoot Bridge on the north to the 89-A Bridge on the south in Cottonwood. An allocation of \$2 million

was appropriated to begin work on it. Because \$2 million doesn't go very far, it fell to the wayside after the original purchases. In 1998 the Board became proactive with purchases again and picked up 60 acres from Valley Concrete as well as others. In 2000 the Board picked up 60 acres with riverfront and 4 acres at the Bridgeport Bridge. There was a gentleman who was so anti State Parks and so anti conservation that his idea of a joke was to have a tombstone on his property that said, "Here lies a Conservationist." In April 2003 he sold us 12 acres along the river because he saw what the agency was doing with the Greenway and felt it was a good thing. He sold the property to ASP so his children would not inherit it and build homes on it.

Mr. Castillo reported that there are a lot of partnerships going on. He referred to the map and pointed out Forest Service and State Trust Land. He pointed out a property that was purchased by Yavapai County as mitigation for putting in a roadway for an extension bridge. The Forest Service will manage that land that contains cliff rose, Verde Valley sage, and other endangered species. The Forest Service is part of the Trails Coalition. There are trails that lead out from the park, one of which is the Limehill Trail (to be completed in 2007). It crosses Forest Service and State Trust Land and ties in with Red Rock State Park. It will be about a 17-mile hiking/biking/equestrian trail that will tie the two parks together. The Trails Coalition consists of the Forest Service, ASP, City of Cottonwood, Town of Clarkdale, campers, hikers, bikers, and equestrians. It is group of people working together to make things happen in the area.

Mr. Castillo noted that the Coalition has worked on a number of trails, one of which will connect Bridgeport over Cornville on Oak Creek. There is a gated community in that area and one of the stipulations was that there be limited access with each homeowner to that trail. There also is a social trail. Only County and State laws can be enforced on a social trail. Park rules cannot be enforced on a social trail.

Mr. Castillo noted that there are some properties for sale. He referred to parcels on the map and noted that when the Board purchased those properties the price per acre was \$6,000. He referred to 12 acres that were purchased later and noted that the price had risen to \$9,000 per acre. By the time the Board purchased the next 12 acres, because of all the purchases the Board had purchased on the flood plain, the price had risen to \$15,000-\$16,000 per acre. The Board's purchases are being used as comparables to increase the prices. He noted that when Del Webb built on property about 3 miles from the park they showed a man flyfishing on the river and advertised it as being only a few minutes from the front door.

Mr. Castillo noted that there is a lot going on in the area. Walmart wants to invest \$35 million in Oak Springs. The property is contiguous with lands managed by the Forest Service and ASP. They want to work with staff to purchase property as partners to increase the agency's chance of getting some of that money. There has been some interest in acquisitions on the Greenway proper. He referred to the map and pointed out a parcel that the owner wants to sell to the agency. It is the very piece needed for the Greenway. The issue is that he wants to move the density of another parcel to this parcel. He pointed to a parcel that was just purchased from Phelps Dodge last year. It will be a good tie in for the trail system. He pointed to a parcel owned by a mining company in Jerome that is of interest. He referred to another three acres that the owner is interested in selling to the agency that would provide access to the river.

Mr. Castillo noted that he and the Chairman looked at the Salt River Project (SRP) property project on I-17 and the Verde River. He received permission from SRP to look at the property and shared photographs of the property. He noted that on several occasions people south of the Bridgeport Bridge have offered to sell us property. There is a possibility for connectivity.

Mr. Travous noted that the Board has discussed the idea of expanding the Verde River from Bridgeport to Tuzigoot Bridge and down to Beasley Flats. He would like to bring that up at the next meeting.

Chairman Stewart noted that it was obvious to her that there is some important land the Board needs to see whether it can acquire and fit into the Greenway. She believes that the work that Mr. Castillo and the rest of the staff have done in this community is outstanding. It has really turned around people's view about having the agency involved in the Greenway.

Mr. Castillo noted that it appears that Flossy Marsh has just been traded by Phelps Dodge to BLM who transferred it to the National Parks Service. It would be a connection route for a trail from Dead Horse Ranch State Park to the Tuzigoot Bridge area.

Mr. Travous noted that he has a meeting scheduled with TNC and SRP in a couple of weeks. They are talking about partnerships. He would like to have that issue on the Agenda for the next meeting.

Chairman Stewart suggested that TNC and SRP be invited to that meeting.

Mr. Cordasco suggested that a representative from the Town of Camp Verde be invited as well.

F. DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. History Convention

Chairman Stewart noted that the History Convention begins this evening. The reception is at Riordan Mansion State Historic Park Friday evening. She invited the Board to attend. The reception runs from 5:00-7:00 p.m. There will be a number of tours of the park. It will be a great opportunity to showcase the park. An attempt was made to schedule a joint meeting with the Historical Society. Unfortunately, it was not possible. She, Mr. Porter, Mr. Travous, and Mr. Ream will be having lunch with their Executive Director and a couple of their Board members.

J. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Staff is recommending that the next meeting be scheduled for May 25-26, 2005 at a meeting room in Pinetop-Lakeside and the Group Building at Lyman Lake State Park, St. Johns, AZ, respectively.**

Chairman Stewart stated that the next Board meeting will be held May 25 and 26 in Pinetop-Lakeside on the 25th and at Lyman Lake on the 26th.

Mr. Cordasco asked for clarification on the meeting dates and sites.

Mr. Travous responded that the meeting on May 25 will be held in Pinetop-Lakeside in the afternoon and will include discussion on the Strategic Plan. A tour will be available at Fool Hollow following the meeting for those wishing to see the park. Those wishing hotel accommodations will spend the night in Springerville or Eagar. The meeting on May 26th will be the regular business meeting of the Board and will begin in the morning.

Mr. Winkleman noted that he will not be able to attend the May meeting due to the change in dates from the original schedule.

- 2. Board members may wish to discuss issues of concern and request staff to place specific items on future Board meeting agendas.**

Chairman Stewart stated that, as discussed earlier, there will be a discussion of the Verde River Greenway on the May Board agenda. She noted that there will be a presentation by SRP and TNC. The Consent Agenda Item relating to the transfer of funds will be on the Agenda.

Mr. Ream noted that there will be an update on negotiations with the Cross Creek Ranch HOA agreement.

J. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Winkleman made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Scalzo seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously and Chairman Stewart adjourned the meeting at 12:07 p.m.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a

sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

SUBMITTED BY:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

APPROVED BY:

Elizabeth Stewart, Chairman